

## **Remarks**

The above Amendments, these Remarks, and a Request for Continued Examination are in reply to the Office Action mailed August 22, 2007. No fee is due for the addition of any new claims.

### **I. Summary of Examiner's Objections/Rejections**

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 10-16 were pending in the Application prior to the Office Action mailed August 22, 2007. The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 10-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable.

Claims 1, 4, 10-13, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0028364 A1) in view of Sullivan (US 2030016238). Claims 3, 5, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0028364 A1) in view of Sullivan (US 2030016238) and further in view of Cohen (US 7024658). Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0028364 A1) in view of Sullivan (US 2030016238) and further in view of Chong (US 20020184610).

### **II. Summary of Applicant's Response**

The present Reply cancels claims 3, 5, and 14, amends claims 1 and 15, and adds new claim 17 to better define embodiments of Applicant's invention, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1, 4, 7, 10-13, and 15-17. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

### **III. Response to Rejections**

The claims were amended to better define embodiments of Applicant's invention. Features

from dependent claims 3, 5, and 14 were moved into Independent Claim 1.

Claim 1 (as amended) states:

A method for extending online help, comprising:  
importing an integrated development environment extension;  
processing documentation content upon import of the integrated development environment extension, wherein the documentation content includes context-sensitive help topics; and  
displaying operations for a help system; wherein search capabilities and table of contents are automatically updated after the integrated development environment extension is imported, wherein the help display is configured to display content in a web browser;  
wherein the documentation content can support delivery of help for a particular component in a single archive file  
wherein the help system includes a control and a control property.

The Office Action rejected Claim 1 (as amended) as unpatentable over the combination of Chan, Sullivan, Cohen, and Chong.

The Office Action conceded that Chan did not teach a help display, wherein search capabilities and table of contents are automatically updated after the IDE extension is imported. However, the Office Action asserted that Sullivan taught those features.

The Office Action conceded that Chan and Sullivan did not teach a help system with a control and a control property. However, the Office Action asserted that Cohen taught these features.

The Office Action conceded that Chan and Sullivan did not teach a help display being configured to display content in a web browser. However, the Office Action asserted that Cohen taught this feature.

The Office Action conceded that Chan and Sullivan did not disclose that the documentation content supports delivery of help for a component in an archive file. However, the Office Action asserted that Chong taught these features in paragraph 436. Chong describes componentization in paragraph 436 and storing components in an archive file. Chong does not, however, disclose that the documentation content supports delivery of help for a component in an archive file.

Applicant does not believe that a *prima facie* rejection has been made to Independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). First, there was no finding in the Office Action as to what is the appropriate level of skill in the art. Second, as the Supreme Court said in KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. \_\_\_, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007), “rejections on obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements, instead there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinnings to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” 82 USPQ2d at 1396. The rejection to Independent Claim 1, based on the combination of Chan, Sullivan, Cohen, and Chong, does not provide an articulated reasoning with a rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. Instead, the Office Action provided mere conclusory statements, and does not meet the requirements of KSR v. Teleflex.

Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiment as defined in Independent Claim 1 is not obvious in view of Chan, Sullivan, Cohen, and Chong. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection to claim 1 be withdrawn. Dependent Claims 4, 7, 10-13, and 15-16 depend from Claim 1. For at least the reasons discussed above with regards to Claim 1, dependent Claims 4, 7, 10-13, and 15-16 are also patentable. Dependent claims 4, 7, 10-13, and 15-16 add their

own limitations which render them patentable in their own right.

IV. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 20, 2007

By: /Thomas K. Plunkett/  
Thomas K. Plunkett  
Reg. No. 57,253

Customer No. 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800